

**Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board**

1422 HOWE AVENUE, SUITE 3, SACRAMENTO, CA 95825

TELEPHONE: (916) 263-2666/ FAX: (916) 263-2668

www.slpab.ca.gov



**STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS  
SPEECH-LANGUAGE PATHOLOGY AND AUDIOLOGY BOARD  
Providence Speech & Hearing Center  
1301 Providence Avenue  
Orange CA 92868-3892  
October 24, 2003  
MINUTES**

**Members Present**

Alison Grimes, AuD, Chairperson  
Sherry Washington, M.A.  
Rebecca Binge, M.A.  
James Till, Ph.D.  
Marcia Raggio, Ph.D.  
Bruce Gerratt, Ph.D.

**Staff Present**

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer  
Candace Raney, Staff Analyst  
Lori Pinson, Staff Analyst  
George Ritter, Legal Counsel

**Members Absent**

Vivian Shannon, M.A.  
Paul Donald, M.D.

**Guests Present**

Friedel Cunningham, Audiologist  
Pamela Royce, Consumer  
Joseph Trunk, Audiologist  
Jim Stassi, Sacramento Advocates, California Academy of Audiology  
Kathy Matonak, Audiologist  
David Majit, Audiologist  
Tabitha Parent-Buck, Audiologist, Chair of Audiology, Arizona School of Health Science  
Gregory Frazer, Audiologist  
Judy Horning, Audiologist, President, California Academy of Audiology  
Mark Faulk, Audiologist, President-Elect, California Academy of Audiology  
Dennis Van Vliet, Audiologist  
O.T. Kenworthy, Audiologist  
Angela Mandas, Speech-Language Pathologist, President, California Speech-Language Hearing Association  
Anne Przybyla, Audiologist  
Naomi Smith, Audiologist  
Geri \_\_\_\_\_, Audiologist  
Sharon Inada, Audiologist

Aprille Engalla, Audiologist  
Louise Mueller, Audiologist  
Dianne Rich, Audiologist  
Ginelle Newman, Audiologist  
Sherrie Hoglin, Audiologist  
Jodi Wojcik, Audiologist  
Emily Jaffe, Audiologist  
Natasha Dewald, Audiologist  
Sylvia Aceyedo, Audiologist  
John Malan, Audiologist  
P.J. Dooley, Supervising Investigator, Division of Investigation  
Fred McGregor, Supervising Investigator, Division of Investigation  
Mike Kania, Southern Area Commander Senior Investigator, Division of Investigation

## **I. Call to Order**

Chairperson Grimes called the meeting to order at 10:10 a.m. and a quorum was established.

## **II. Introductions**

Those present introduced themselves.

Ms. Grimes stated that the Board needed to appoint a new member to serve on the Continuing Professional Development Committee and asked for volunteers.

Ms. Raggio volunteered and was appointed to serve as a member of the Continuing Professional Development Committee.

## **III. Approval of Meeting Minutes for July 10-11, 2003 Committee Meetings and Full Board Meeting**

The Board discussed minor grammatical edits to the minutes.

M/S/C: Binge/Raggio

The Board approved the July 10-11, 2003 Committee Meeting and Full Board Meeting minutes as amended.

## **IV. Discussion on Proposed Amendments to California Code of Regulations Sections 1399.152 & 1399.156.4 Regarding Board-Approved Institutions & the Advertisement of Professional Degrees**

Ms. Grimes provided the history of events that prompted the need for Board action to revisit and amend the definition of a Board-approved institution. She explained that the

impetus behind the change stemmed from the need to remove antiquated references in the existing regulations and to develop an educational standard that will address the current professional transition to a doctorate degree as the entry level standard for the practice of audiology.

Ms. Grimes outlined several amendment options that the Board has to reflect the necessary change and explained the potential pitfalls to a number of the options. She stated that the Board could amend the regulations to state that it will acknowledge the educational standards of any regionally accredited institution absent specific program accreditation. However, she stated that this revision may not serve the best interest of the consumer or the profession as it would enable any post-secondary institution to award a professional degree even though the institution may not have a well-developed professional training program. Secondly, the Board can recognize doctoral programs that reside in an institution that offers a master's level program accredited by the Council on Academic Accreditation (CAA) of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association (ASHA). Like the previous option, this does not ensure the quality of the doctoral program offered by the sponsoring institution. The Board can recognize CAA candidacy programs. However, Ms. Grimes stated that the Board previously reviewed the CAA candidacy standards and determined that the standards appeared lax. She stated that the Board could develop its own standards for program approval and pointed out that the existing regulations provide the Board with the authority to accredit institutions in its discretion. She stated that this option is not feasible as the Board does not have the staff expertise or financial resources to become an accrediting body. Finally, the Board can make only technical changes to the regulations such as changing the reference to the Educational Standards Board of ASHA to the Council on Academic Accreditation and other similar technical edits. Ms. Grimes explained that the last option would be irresponsible of the Board because the CAA does not accredit post-master's programs and has been criticized by the Department of Education for failing to define higher and more rigorous standards for doctoral programs as compared to the standards it applies to master's programs. Ms. Grimes reported that her colleagues have expressed concern that CAA is understaffed and may not be conducting timely site reviews or responding to program needs. She stated that there is strong professional objection to acknowledging one voluntary professional organization, such as ASHA, as the only accrediting body for professional training programs. Ms. Grimes stated that the Board can craft language that will be broad enough to encompass future accreditation standards whether they are developed by the CAA or the Accreditation Commission of Audiology Education (ACAE), which is a joint organization of the American Academy of Audiology and the Academy of Dispensing Audiologists.

Ms. Grimes informed the public that she, Ms. Raggio, and Ms. Del Mugnaio attended a meeting of the California Council of Academic Programs in Communicative Sciences and Disorders to discuss the issue of program accreditation. She stated that a subcommittee of the Council was formed with the mission to develop a proposed definition of a Board-approved institution including program specific components for awarding professional degrees in speech-language pathology and audiology. She

stated that a copy of a letter from the subcommittee regarding the project was available to the public and that the proposed language was due to the Board by January 2004.

Ms. Raggio assured the public that the Board is aware of the bind in which the existing regulations place many professionals who have already earned an AuD, and who are unable to advertise the advanced credential because the institution where the degree was earned may not meet the current Board-approved institution regulations.

Ms. Bingea supported the efforts of many professionals in furthering their education as she stated that the primary reason for doing so is to improve the professional services to the consumers of the State. She stressed that the Board is not attempting to impede the professional growth of any practitioner and is working diligently to find a responsible resolution to the situation.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that the Board's proposed action is not an attempt to change the licensing standards to require a doctorate degree as the educational standard. She emphasized that this would require a statutory change that may not be well supported by documented evidence that the current level of education is inadequate and places consumers at risk for potential harm. She explained that the professional community must be able to convince the Legislature that there is a compelling need to raise the educational standard of the profession and that the need must outweigh access issues and economic barrier issues.

A general discussion ensued regarding the process for implementing a professional movement to change the licensing standards to require a doctorate level degree.

Ms. Washington inquired as to how long it may be that the Board would need to rely solely upon the definition of an approved educational program without the benefit of recognizing a professional accrediting body that can conduct site reviews and conduct a more comprehensive program evaluation.

Ms. Grimes indicated that it was her understanding that the ACAE was poised to introduce its accreditation standards in fall of 2003 but was delayed. She suggested that the standards should be available soon.

Ms. Grimes invited members of the public to address the Board on the issue.

Ms. Pamela Royce, hearing impaired consumer, attorney, and client of Mr. Joseph Trunk's, indicated that she became interested in the matter after Mr. Trunk received a letter from the Board prohibiting him from advertising his advanced degree because it was earned from an institution that did not meet the Board's current regulations. She praised the Board for instigating the much needed change and for encouraging both professional and consumer involvement. Ms. Royce provided the Board with grammatical edits to the draft regulation language. She suggested that the Board may want to examine changing its licensing standards to eliminate the requirement for a

specific educational degree achievement but rather require only the passage of a rigorous professional examination such as what is currently required of licensed attorneys. She further stated that the consumer is most likely not particularly concerned with the accreditation merits of an institution but rather is aware that a professional should be licensed by a licensing agency that has made a determination that an individual is qualified to practice. She also stated that accreditation may be withheld from some institutions for non-academic reasons. Ms. Royce also expressed her concerns with the Board's existing advertising regulations and took issue with the reference in regulation to an advanced degree as "generic" if it is a non-professional degree in speech-language pathology and audiology. She also asserted that the current advertising regulations are not equitable, conflict with Business and Professions Code Sections 17500 and 17500.1, may violate the First Amendment, Freedom of Speech, and the Fourteenth Amendment, which provides for equal protection under the law. Ms. Royce suggested that a viable solution may be to change the regulation language to require that any person advertising an advanced degree must state the degree discipline and the institution where the degree was earned in any public advertisement.

Ms. Grimes reminded the public that written testimony is welcome at any time and may be mailed directly to the Board office.

Several public attendees expressed their gratitude to the Board for working diligently and responsibly to find a solution by amending the regulations.

Mr. Dennis Van Vliet stated that the profession should not shy away from pursuing a change to the statute to reflect a higher educational standard merely because it may be a difficult change to enact.

Ms. Tabitha Parent-Buck clarified CAA's role in accrediting post-baccalaureate programs. She also stated that the Board could develop language in the interim that would recognize institutions that are accredited by an organization approved by the United States Department of Education for the accreditation of audiology programs specifically. She spoke to the merits of the four distance-learning, post-masters AuD programs currently in existence.

A public participant inquired about the Board's enforcement program and asked whether the Board would be increasing its enforcement activity related to advertising violations to further support its existence during Sunset review.

Ms. Del Mugnaio assured the public that this would not be the case and explained the complaint process and the Board's enforcement authority.

Mr. Joseph Trunk addressed the Board in support of the quality of the existing AuD programs and indicated that he has never been questioned by a consumer about the merits of his advanced degree.

A general discussion ensued regarding the challenges with the existing advertising regulations in terms of enforcing the existing definition of a Board-approved program.

Ms. Grimes expressed the Board's appreciation to the subcommittee of the California Council of Academic Programs in Communicative Sciences and Disorders for offering to develop proposed language for Board consideration.

**V. Pursuant to California Code of Regulations Section 1399.152, Request for Board to Consider Columbia Commonwealth University as an Institution Approved by the Board for the purposes of Degree Recognition**

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that this issue results from an enforcement case in which the individual was requested to amend his advertising of his Ph.D. by including the name of the discipline in which his degree was earned. This individual obtained his Ph.D. through Columbia Commonwealth University, a university that neither holds regional accreditation nor is approved by the Board for the purpose of degree recognition. The individual requested that the Board reconsider the merits of Columbia Commonwealth University.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that legal counsel, George Ritter, has historical knowledge regarding this particular institution and turned the discussion over to him.

Mr. Ritter explained that he is familiar with Dr. Les Carr from Mr. Ritter's previous employment with the Council for Private Postsecondary & Vocational Education (CPPVE) wherein he encountered a legal matter involving an institution by the name Columbia Pacific University, founded by Dr. Carr. Columbia Pacific University operated in California for a number of years. In 1996, Columbia Pacific University came up for review before the CPPVE, which at that time was the state approval body for postsecondary education that were not regionally accredited. The Council denied their application for approval, following which Columbia Pacific appealed the denial. The denial was heard in the Court of Appeals and was ultimately upheld by an Administrative Law Judge.

Mr. Ritter provided examples of information considered by the Administrative Law Judge in review of the denial.

Columbia Pacific University subsequently filed a Writ of Mandate appealing the denial and the decision of the Administrative Law Judge in Alameda County Superior Court. The Appeals Court also upheld the denial.

Columbia Pacific University continued to operate without licensure until the Council filed an action in Marin County for injunctive relief to cease the operation of the University. The action was appealed and the court upheld the permanent injunction citing that the University was operating illegally.

Columbia Pacific University filed a petition for review with the California Superior Court, and the petition was denied.

Mr. Ritter provided information to the Board that suggested that Columbia Pacific University reinvented itself as Columbia Commonwealth University with Dr. Carr as President. It is accredited by the Government of Malawi and is now operating in Wyoming. A closer review revealed that the address listed for Columbia Commonwealth was actually a Mail Boxes Etc location.

M/S/C: Till/Washington

The Board voted to deny the request to consider Columbia Commonwealth University as an institution approved by the Board for purposes of degree recognition.

**VI. Chairperson's Report (Alison Grimes)**  
**Report on the State Licensure Subcommittee of the Government Relations Committee of the American Academy of Audiology**

Ms. Grimes stated that she is a member of the Subcommittee on State Licensure, a subcommittee of the Government Affairs Committee for the American Academy of Audiology. The Subcommittee met on August 11-12, 2003 at the Academy headquarters with the mission of developing guidelines and strategies to assist states in implementing changes in their respective scope of practice provisions. The meeting was attended by a number of people from across the country.

Ms. Grimes explained that the Subcommittee has been assigned four specific charges. The charges include ensuring that all state licensure laws encompass the audiology scope of practice, that states adhere to federal Medicaid and Medicare regulations pertaining to the provision of audiology services, to protect the audiology scope of practice from encroachment, and to develop model language for provisional licensure of the fourth year AUD student.

Ms. Grimes stated that suggested actions included developing a network of national contacts. Ms. Grimes proposed a meeting of all audiologists who serve on state licensing boards across the country to meet during the American Academy of Audiology meeting in Salt Lake City in Spring 2004. This would provide an opportunity to exchange information. Other suggested actions included defining the term "qualified licensed practitioner," revisiting the scope of practice, and examining the issue of fourth year licensure vs. fourth year unpaid non-licensed externship. The Subcommittee developed FAQ's that are posted on the Academy's website. The Academy has developed a model licensing law that includes qualifications such as holding a doctoral degree in audiology from a program that has been accredited by an organization recognized by the U.S. Department of Education and that incorporates academic coursework and clinical training determined by the state licensing board to be sufficient for licensure.

Ms. Grimes stated that the Academy is holding a conference in January 2004 to discuss the issue of whether fourth year AuD students should be licensed.

Ms. Grimes stated that she is hopeful that the Subcommittee will be able to make recommendations and provide additional thoughts that may be helpful to this Board in revising its laws and regulations regarding audiology academic and professional training standards.

## **VII. Committee Reports**

### **A. Continuing Professional Development Committee (Gerratt)**

Mr. Gerratt stated that the Continuing Professional Development Committee met October 23, 2003 to discuss several matters.

Mr. Gerratt explained that the first issue of discussion was to review a number of CPD courses to determine if the course content would be applicable for CPD license renewal requirements. He stated that each course was reviewed. A number were determined not to be practice specific and therefore were not in compliance with the CPD license renewal requirements. The Committee also requested additional information regarding the course, "How Does Your Engine Run?"

Mr. Gerratt stated that the Committee reviewed two appeals from licensees regarding courses submitted for credit that had been denied by Board staff. The Committee reviewed the appeals and determined that the denials should be upheld with the exception of one course, "The Explosive Child," that the Committee requested additional information for review.

Mr. Gerratt stated that the Committee also discussed proposed amendments to the existing CPD program components and standards. The issue at hand was the authority for the Board to review individual courses rather than solely approve providers of the courses. This would require a statutory change.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that there were statutory and regulatory changes required to grant the board the authority to approve courses and to also delineate some specific prohibitions for audiologists that not more than 50 percent of their CPD courses shall be obtained from hearing aid manufacturers and hearing aid dispensers.

M/S/C: Raggio/Grimes

The Board voted to accept the report and recommendation of the Continuing Professional Development Committee.



## **B. Audiology Practice Committee (Bingea)**

Ms. Bingea stated that the Audiology Practice Committee met to review reference materials for CPD. The Committee developed a list of topics that could be used as a general guideline for Board staff to determine appropriate coursework for audiologist until such time as the law is changed to grant the Board the authority to approve courses that are offered for CPD license renewal credit.

Ms. Bingea stated that the Committee also reviewed the legislative and regulatory proposal to amend the CPD components as reported by the CPD Committee.

Ms. Bingea explained that Ms. Del Mugnaio provided updated information to the Committee regarding legislation of interest to the Committee and to the Board.

AB 525 amended the Hearing Aid Dispenser's Licensing Law regarding dispensing of hearing aids to children 16 years of age and younger. This changes the requirement that an audiologist be certified by ASHA to require that the audiologists be licensed by the state. AB 525 passed in July 2003 and will become effective January 1, 2004.

SB 174 requires that health care service plans and insurance companies provide hearing aid coverage of up to \$1000 for children 18 years of age and younger. This bill was assigned to a UC Study Commission to determine the cost-benefit analysis. To date, there has been no formal report from the commission. Ms. Del Mugnaio will continue to track the bill and update the Board on the status.

SB 648 amends the Civil Code that allows hearing aid dispensers to retain a nominal non-refundable adjustment fee for hearing aids returned during the device warranty period. This bill is a two-year bill and is scheduled to be heard in the Policy Committee in January 2004. Ms. Del Mugnaio will attend the Committee meeting and report to the Board.

AB 747 amends the Business and Professions Code that would allow the Department of Health Services (DHS) to revise its schedule of maximum allowable reimbursement rates for durable medical equipment, including hearing aids, and would allow the DHS flexibility in including particular products. This bill passed and was signed by the Governor on October 2, 2003, and will take effect January 1, 2004.

Ms. Bingea stated that the Committee held a general discussion of the Board's progress regarding the upcoming sunset review report.

Ms. Bingea stated that the Committee also discussed the status of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) proposed Rule for audiologists' professional standards. CMS has proposed one standard definition for audiology providers for both Medicare and Medicaid, which amends the definition of an audiologist from one who

holds ASHA certification to one who holds state licensure. The proposed Rule was first published in April 2003, public comment period has ended and the final statement of reasons is currently being developed. The final Rule is scheduled to be published around April 2004.

M/S/C: Grimes/Raggio

The Board voted to accept the report and recommendations of the Audiology Practice Committee.

## **VIII. Executive Officer's Report (Annemarie Del Mugnaio)**

### **A. Legislation of Interest to the Board**

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that SB 364 includes an amendment to extend the Board's sunset date to January 2006.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that AB 827 changes the requirements for public member appointments to serve on a Board. The Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology Board currently has six professional members, one public otolaryngologist member and two public members. Public members are individuals who have an interest or connection to the field but are not practicing professionals. The public members represent the consumer voice for the Board. The provisions have been changed to disallow any person who has any connection or is engaged in any type of activity that lies within the field of industry or profession. This bill will take effect in January 2004.

### **B. Budget Update**

Ms. Del Mugnaio provided the Board with an updated projection of the board's current budget situation.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that she had reported at a previous meeting that the Department of Finance (DOF) required all state agencies to reduce their total budget by 10 percent. This figure was subsequently increased to 16 percent for general funded agencies and 12 percent for special funded agencies. This board was able to accomplish this by further reducing Board member per diem.

### **C. Report on Board Action to Address Potential Misleading Advertisements & Unlicensed Practice by "Behavior Analysts (Behaviorists)" and "Educational Therapists"**

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the Speech-Language Pathology Practice Committee discussed, at length, possible actions to address potential misleading advertising and possible unlicensed practice by individuals who are known as "behavior analysts" or "educational therapists." Potential overlap exists in the services provided by these unlicensed groups of practitioners. Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that she has sent

correspondence to the appropriate parties including the Association of Educational Therapy to notify such groups or individuals of the advertising issue.

Ms. Del Mugnaio informed the Board that in response to the contact letter, the Association of Education Therapy has expressed an interest in working with the Board in educating their group of service providers that there are certain advertising provisions that must be adhered to and that they must refrain from using terms that would imply they are speech-language pathologists.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that the correspondence provides information regarding the scope of practice of speech-language pathology and how the use of similar titles is potentially misleading.

**D. Status of the California Board of Occupational Therapy's Proposed Regulations regarding "Swallowing Assessment, Evaluation or Intervention"**

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that this issue has been discussed at several past board meetings. The Occupation Therapy Board is in the process of developing advanced certificate regulations. Within those regulations, occupational therapists who hold an advanced certification would be able to participate in swallowing assessments, evaluation and intervention. The regulations have met significant opposition. The OT Board will hold a meeting in November 2003 in Ontario to discuss the status of the proposed regulations. The final statement of reasons is currently being developed.

**E. Continuing Professional Development Audit Update**

Ms. Del Mugnaio provided the Board with an update regarding the Continuing Professional Development Audit. Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that the primary reason for no response to the Board's audit requests is that licensees fail to maintain a current address of record. Ms. Del Mugnaio reiterated that, according to law, a licensee must keep their address current with the board.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that based upon compliance rates and staff workload, the board will vary the percentage of licensees audited.

**F. Distribution of Department of Consumer Affairs Strategic Plan**

Ms. Del Mugnaio distributed the Department of Consumer Affairs Strategic Plan to each of the Board Members.

**G. Status on Legislative initiative to Define Prohibited Business Arrangements within the "Speech-Language Pathologists and Audiologists Licensure Act"**

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that legal counsel has amended the draft statutory language developed to address the issue of prohibited business arrangements. She stated that

the draft proposal has been submitted to the Department of Consumer Affairs for review and consideration to be included in Departmental omnibus bill. She has not heard from the Department regarding its review.

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that the language has been crafted to address the issue of licensees who have an agreement with a health care service plan to provide services at a discounted rate or for free in exchange for the exclusive referral of every plan enrollee, wherein the basis for the referral is the financial benefit to the health care service plan and the guaranteed referrals, not the medical need of the client.

Ms. Del Mugnaio stated that further modification of the language may be necessary in order to capture the specific activity that the Board is attempting to legislate against and that clearly constitutes a violation of Business & Professions Code Section 650.

#### **H. Reappointment Process for Board Members**

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that the term of several professional members of the Board are due to expire December 1, 2004. Each term is four years with a one-year grace period. Each member was encouraged to submit correspondence to the Governor's Appointments Secretary requesting reappointment. In addition, Ms. Grimes will submit correspondence to the Appointment Secretary in support of the reappointment of each interested Board member.

#### **IX. Enforcement/Licensing Statistical Reports (Candace Raney/Lori Pinson)**

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that both fourth quarter and fiscal year reports for enforcement and licensing were provided.

#### **X. Board Members as Officers in Professional Associations**

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that there are no statutory prohibitions regarding Board members serving as officers in professional associations. However, there are cases where this situation may present a conflict of interest or the appearance of dueling loyalties.

The Board discussed the matter and determined that for Board members serving as officers in professional associations, each situation should be discussed with legal counsel on a case-by-case basis prior to accepting any such position.

#### **XI. Discuss Draft Sunset Review Narrative and Updated Time-Line for Completion of Final Report**

Ms. Del Mugnaio explained that she intends to complete her administrative edits to the Sunset Review Report by early January for submission to the Board for consideration. She requested that all outstanding assignments be submitted to Ms. Raggio no later

than November 15, 2003 so that the document to be presented to the Board in January can be as inclusive as possible.

**XII. Closed Session (pursuant to Government Code Subsections 11126 (c)(3), Proposed Decisions/Stipulations/Other APA Enforcement**

**A. Proposed Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order in the Matter of the Accusation Against Richard Vernon Webster, SP 496**

**B. Proposed Stipulated Settlement and Disciplinary Order in the Matter of the Accusation Against Beth Ann Rogers, SP 8242**

**XIII. Meeting Calendar 2004**

Ms. Del Mugnaio reminded the Board Members of the future Board meetings scheduled for January 22-23, 2004 in Sacramento and April 15-16, 2004 to be held in San Francisco.

The Board discussed dates to hold a July 2004 Board meeting and decided to schedule the meeting for July 1-2, 2004 to be held in Los Angeles.

**XIV. Public Comment on Items Not on the Agenda**

There were no additional public comments.

**XV. Announcements**

**A. Next Board Meeting is January 22-23, 2004 Sacramento**

The next board meeting is scheduled for January 22-23, 2004 to be held in Sacramento.

**XVI. Adjournment**

There being no further discussion, Chairperson Grimes adjourned the meeting at 4:07p.m.

---

Annemarie Del Mugnaio, Executive Officer